R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 013 482 EA 000 693

VIEWPOINTS FOR THE STUDY OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

BY- STOKE, HAROLD W.
OREGON UNIV., EUGENE

PUB DATE NOV 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.92 48P.

DESCRIPTORS- *EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, *HIGHER EDUCATION, *ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, SOCIAL SCIENCES, *ADMINISTRATOR ROLE, *ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS, ECONOMICS, POLITICAL SCIENCE, PSYCHOLOGY, EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY, EDUCATIONAL DEMAND, INVESTMENT, SOCIOLOGY, DECISION MAKING, EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, PUBLIC RELATIONS, STUDENT ENROLLMENT, EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES, EUGENE,

HIGHER EDUCATION MUST BE VIEWED IN TERMS OF ECONOMICS, POLITICAL SCIENCE, SOCIOLOGY, AND PSYCHOLOGY. THE TYPES OF QUESTIONS WHICH SOCIAL SCIENTISTS USUALLY ASK ABOUT ORGANIZATIONS AND AGENCIES IN INDUSTRY, BUSINESS, AND OTHER SETTINGS ARE RAISED ABOUT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES. STUDENT AND ADMINISTRATOR PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH THE DIVERSITY AND POTENTIAL STUDENT CHOICE OF INSTITUTIONS ARE DISCUSSED IN TERMS OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS, CHURCH-RELATED INSTITUTIONS, COLLEGES VERSUS UNIVERSITIES, AND THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE. ORGANIZATIONAL PROBLEMS ARE BETTER ANALYZED WITH CONCEPTS OF "MEANING" AND "PURPOSE" RATHER THAN IN TERMS OF THE STANDARD "OPERATIONAL" QUESTION. THE SOCIAL SCIENCES CAN BE STUDIED IN TERMS OF EDUCATIONAL DEMAND, HIGHER EDUCATION AS AN INVESTMENT, HIGHER EDUCATION AS A BUSINESS ENTERPRISE, HIGHER EDUCATION AS A POLITICAL SCIENCE, AND EDUCATIONAL BUREAUCRACY, PSYCHOLOGY, SOCIOLOGY, AND HISTORY. EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY ON SUCH FACTORS AS DECISIONMAKING, INTERPRETATION, AND ARTFULNESS IS IMPORTANT IN DETERMINING THE SUCCESS OF ADMINISTRATORS. TWO ADDITIONAL PROBLEMS FACING ADMINISTRATORS ARE THE CRISIS PROBLEM AND THE CONTINUING PROBLEM. THE CRISIS PROBLEM ENTAILS THE UPSURGE OF STUDENT ENROLLMENT, THE EXPANSION OF RESEARCH, AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW AND DEMANDING PROGRAMS OF PUBLIC SERVICE. THE CONTINUING PROBLEMS INVOLVE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PURPOSES AND PROCESSES OF EDUCATION AND THE APPRAISAL OF THE RESULTS. THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THE CENTER FOR THE ADVANCED STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OREGON 97403, FOR $1.00. (HW)

ED013482

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

◆ ◆ ◆

VIEWPOINTS FOR THE STUDY OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

HAROLD W. STOKE

EA 000 693

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A Publication of

THE CENTER FOR THE ADVANCED STUDY OF
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
Eugene, Oregon

VIEWPOINTS FOR THE STUDY OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

HAROLD W. STOKE

$ 1.00

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Roland Pellegrin, Dir., CASEA
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

© Copyright 1966

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

First Printing, November, 1966
Second Printing, January, 1967

The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration at the University of Oregon is a national research and development center which was established under the provisions of the Cooperative Research Program of the United States Office of Education. The research and development reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Division of Laboratories and Research Development of the U.S. Office of Education. No federal funds were used in the publication of this report.

Printed in the United States of America
at the University of Oregon Press, Eugene, Oregon

Designed and edited by Joanne M. Kitchel

Library of Congress Catalog Number 66-65154

FOREWORD

If one examines the history of complex institutional enterprises, he discovers that when organizations grow and assume complex functions they must make significant organizational adaptations in order to achieve their internal goals and meet the demands of the environments to which they relate. Institutions of higher education are not an exception to the rule; they must face up to new imperatives occasioned by the demands to which they are subjected by a society that holds almost innumerable expectations for its colleges and universities. As the problems of higher education become increasingly diverse and pressing, considerations relevant to organization and administration assume complexities that were unfamiliar even in the recent past. Under these circumstances, traditional ways of looking at institutional operations no longer provide adequate perspectives; nor is the knowledge base upon which organization and administration rest adequate under existing conditions.

In this context it is fruitful to ask new questions about the old as well as the new problems that face higher education. As Dr. Harold W. Stoke makes evident in this collection of essays, a vast array of organizational and administrative problems confronts those who are charged with the operation of colleges and universities. Nonetheless it remains a curious fact that scholars have not yet turned their attention to analyzing the organization and administration of higher education to anything approaching the extent to which they have studied similar problems either in the public schools or in other institutional areas such as industry, business, or government. Self-conscious, systematic analysis of problems has tended to be occasional and sporadic. Even more scarce has been systematic empirical research on the organization and administration of colleges and universities. Such research is just beginning to emerge as a major endeavor of scholars from a number of disciplines.

Dr. Stoke is not concerned with presenting or summarizing research results in these essays. Rather, he reports a variety of important facts that point up the changing nature of colleges and universities, and he calls attention to the need for fresh viewpoints in dealing with the administrative and organizational problems with which these institutions are confronted. He indicates ways in which the body of knowledge pertaining to colleges and universities

needs to be expanded, and he notes the kinds of contributions that can be made by the social sciences, history, and philosophy. These various disciplines can raise questions that provide fresh vantage points for looking at organizational problems; they can also make research contributions that will increase and broaden the knowledge base.

Rather than continuing to view organizational "problems" in terms of standard "operational" questions, Dr. Stoke advocates organizing research and analysis around concepts of "meaning" and "purpose." In addition to current studies that consist mainly of the tabulation and description of data, he urges increased use of techniques of analysis and interpretation. Important here also is raising new questions about colleges and universities of the sort that social scientists customarily ask about organizations and agencies in industry, business, and other settings.

The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration is pleased to publish these essays in the hope that they will stimulate discussion and inquiry. If they do, the publication will serve its purpose of encouraging fresh viewpoints for studying the administration of higher education.

ROLAND J. PELLEGRIN, Director
CENTER FOR THE ADVANCED STUDY OF
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

November, 1966
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OREGON

CONTENTS

Introduction 1

I - DIVERSITY IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION AND SOME ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS 3

II - THE SOCIAL STUDIES AND ADMINISTRATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION 12

III - EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION 21

IV - CRISIS AND CONTINUITY IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION 29

Bibliographical Note 38

Introduction

"The world," said Samuel Johnson, "does not need to be informed so much as it needs to be reminded." It is no longer necessary to inform students of administration in higher education - only to remind them - that what goes on off the campuses may affect colleges and universities more than what happens on campuses, that, for the educational administrator, the study of other fields may be more important than the study of education.

This is the theory that underlies these viewpoints on the study of administration in higher education. Higher education has become so much a part of the society which supports it and which, in turn, it affects, that its study must now range far beyond the past provinces of educational administration. A change in the military draft regulations, for example, may affect the problems of student admissions and retentions or even the quality of operations on a campus more than any regulation a faculty may make.

It is true that the administrator in higher education will still be occupied primarily with problems which appear under the usual categories of administration, students, faculties, buildings and budgets, but he can no longer manage these well unless he appreciates more fully the breadth and the force of outside factors which now play upon them. Moreover, the study of administration loses its vitality and interest unless it is occasionally renewed by contact with the forces which shape it and which it, in turn, attempts to accommodate and control.

These notes suggest that the study of the administration of higher education be broadened to include the study of higher education itself, on the same theory that an electrician can handle electricity more effectively and safely the more he knows about it. This is why, in what follows, the assumption is made that administration is something more than organization and management. The effective administrator is concerned with the well-being of the entire enterprise. This must include not only care for its current operations, but for the realization of its long-range purposes. It follows that good administration depends upon a wide knowledge of education. With that assumption we come full circle: it is impossible to understand education today without a substantial knowledge of many fields other than education as well. Higher education is no longer a province reserved for educators. It now belongs to economics, political science,

sociology, psychology, and a large number of other things as well. Nor is it enough that the administrator in higher education should be trained particularly in the social studies; it is now necessary for higher education to be included among the social sciences themselves and to be studied by the social scientists.

A substantial beginning has already been made to broaden and invigorate the study of administration in higher education by widening its horizons. These notes have only the modest purpose of encouraging a trend already begun, to serve, in Samuel Johnson's phrase, as a "reminder." They are meant to point out areas favorable for prospecting without intending to forecast what ore is to be found, what value it may have or the uses to which it can be put. The areas are large and discoveries should be rewarding. There are many claims to be staked out.

I

DIVERSITY IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION AND SOME ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

Too often higher education has been thought and written about as if it were a unit to which all concepts and generalizations uniformly and universally applied. The truth is that one of the most important facts about American higher education is its diversity and this must be recognized in any plans for the study of its administration. Higher education in the United States is an agglomeration of institutions of the most uneven and varied sort. They differ in origin, size, support and purpose. There are junior colleges, colleges, universities and specialized institutions. There are public and private schools, religious and secular, women's schools, men's schools and co-educational schools. Some are large, some small; some rich, some poor; there are great variations in the quality of students, faculties and facilities. All of these characteristics affect their "administration," some more importantly than others.

Manifestations of Diversity

These variations would become clear quickly and dramatically if one were able to sit with the Boards of Trustees, say of Miami University, a state university in Ohio, the Colorado Woman's College, a church-related college, the University of Chicago, a major private, secular university, and the San Jacinto Junior College in Temple, Texas, and share in a search for a suitable president for each institution. Each board is looking for some combination of training interests, experience and attitudes which it regards as appropriate and necessary for an effective administrator of its particular school. What the University of Chicago needs as a president is certainly not what is needed for the Colorado Woman's College, nor vice versa. Adequate presidents for those institutions would probably both be failures at the San Jacinto Junior College. What is true about the presidents for each of these institutions will also be true to a considerable extent for persons in other administrative posts and even for their respective faculties. In short, the variety of institutions in higher education is an important administrative fact and deserves more investigation and more explicit recognition than it has received.

There are many ways in which variations among institutions of higher learning significantly reveal themselves. There are a few professional educational organizations which undertake to comprehend all types of institutions in their memberships, for example, the American Council on Education, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of Higher Education. It is interesting, however, that at the annual meetings of these organizations the presidents and the deans of similar institutions tend to drift together--private schools, public schools, colleges and universities. While such fellow-feeling among institutions of the same type would appear to be self-explanatory, the reasons for it deserve to be explored as reflecting underlying facts which have important administrative implications.

Public and Private Institutions

Take, for example, the administrative differences which arise out of one of the most common classifications of institutions, public as against private schools. Actually the administrators in each are involved in many of the same kinds of problems--relationships to a board of control, raising and spending money, public relations and the academic affairs involving faculties and students. But in the way these matters present themselves and are dealt with there will be enough distinction so that eventually a different set of attitudes, amounting to a "mind set," will be developed in each. For the public institution the factor of public opinion will be different from that of the private institution. The raising of money and its expenditure will be affected by different sets of considerations. Other differences also tend to appear in students and faculties as well as administrators of public as against private institutions. The administrators of Northern State University whose students attend as a matter of "legal right" will, for example, think differently about student relationships than will the president of Alhambra College whose students attend as a result of either permission or persuasion. Consequently, the attitudes of students and the regulations to which they are subject will be subtly affected. These differences are not easy to describe, but they are administratively important and pervasive. If, as occasionally happens, administrators change from public to private institutions, or vice versa, they find themselves uncomfortable until they have adjusted themselves to the administrative attitudes and processes appropriate to each.

Church-Related Institutions

Even more important administratively is the classification of institutions according to purposes. This is illustrated particularly well in the case of religious or church-related as against secular colleges or universities. It must be remembered that about 40 per cent of the colleges and universities in the United States are classified as church-related. This description may mean much or little, varying in degrees of religious identity from virtual branches of church establishments to the most nominal kinds of relationships. But the administration of such colleges is profoundly affected by the degree of their religious affiliation. The admission of students, the character of the discipline and of concern about them, the recruitment and retention of the faculty, the nature of the curriculum, will all be influenced by views peculiar to each institution and, for church-related institutions, may be widely different from those of secular kind. Academic freedom, which is such an important professional concern in secular colleges is, in church-related institutions, subject to the constraints of overriding religious tenets. The declaration of the American Association of University Professors, an organization which is ordinarily the vociferous champion of academic freedom, says only: "...In the case of institutions which impose upon their faculties doctrinal standards of a sectarian or partisan character, these standards should be clearly defined and the body or individual having the authority to interpret them in case of controversy should be designated."* Obviously where a claim to academic freedom would negate the work for which the institution itself exists, insistence on such freedom does not make sense. In the eagerness to establish generalizations about higher education, the important administrative consequences of differences between the church-related and the secular institution have been slighted.

Colleges versus Universities

Other kinds of distinctions among institutions which need more study are the differences between colleges and universities. It is, for example, popularly thought that colleges

---

*"Principles of Academic Freedom," AAUP Bulletin, XL, 1955, pp. 93-112.

and universities are fundamentally alike, that a college is somehow only a less "fullgrown" university, or that a university is only a more complicated college and that the two can be thought about and even administered in the same way. What would be the consequences for the study of administration and for higher education itself if the hypothesis were generally accepted that while colleges resemble universities in form and in many of their activities they are in essense quite different institutions?

The hypothesis is in fact quite defensible and a failure to accept it may be a major source of confusion in educational administration. Colleges are established and operate with a variety of purposes and considerations in mind--social, religious, vocational, as well as "educational." They are primarily concerned with the kind of "human product" they may turn out and their curricula, their teaching and their administration are shaped by the ideal they have in mind. Universities, on the other hand, are less governed by teaching or by the kind of "citizen" their work produces; their basic purpose is quite different, namely, the discovery, clarification, and systemization of knowledge. Colleges are, of course, concerned with "truth" but they are also concerned--in fact, more immediately concerned--with other things as well: character, health, manners, morals, and the whole complex business of transforming youth into the kinds of adults which a particular college finds desirable.

The university, by contrast, is primarily concerned with the difficult, laborious, often grim business of "getting at the truth" regardless of its effect on individuals or institutions. This distinctive mission must be reflected in its operation and incorporated in its administration. Take again the matter of academic freedom. A college for its successful operation needs only that degree of freedom which its educational purposes require, a degree of freedom which may or may not be subject to considerable limitation. For universities, on the other hand, freedom is so essential to the accomplishment of their distinctive purposes that any threat to academic freedom must be viewed with alarm. Indeed, some curtailments of freedom may actually have the effect of transforming the university into little more than an agency of propaganda.

The evolution of higher education is sharpening the distinctions between colleges and universities, with administrative implications which are increasingly important. Perhaps the distinction is seen most clearly in the preoccupation of the college with teaching and that of the univer-

sity with research. This distinction puts a whole series of administrative differences into action. They will manifest themselves, for example, in the recruitment and treatment of faculties. Expectations made of faculties in the university are quite different from the expectations made of faculties in a college by reason of the basic differences in the fundamental purposes of each institution. Hence, the administrative policies and decisions affecting faculties of the two kinds of institutions will constantly reflect this fact. They will also reveal themselves in other ways: the handling of students, the kinds of faculties needed and obtained, and the organization of the curriculum.

The Community College

Another distinctive, and the most rapidly expanding component of higher education is the two-year community college. Its purposes are distinguishable from both the four-year college and from the university. Its great growth can be accounted for by the comparative ease with which two-year colleges can be established in local communities which are faced with college-going populations larger than those which can be readily accommodated in the established four-year institutions in the area. As local institutions they can serve as "try-out" colleges for students who are uncertain as to their future educational interests or capacities, and as preparatory schools for those who wish later to transfer to higher institutions. Community colleges thus provide for both terminal and continuing education by a combination of vocational education and interest in the liberal arts. Local conditions and backgrounds are likely to affect the "educational mix" which any given community college provides, a fact which will affect its daily administration. For the student of administration the combination of local controls, state and federal relationships, vocational programs, a curriculum in liberal arts and, nearly always, adult education as represented in the community college, presents one of the most challenging problems in higher education.

The Student's Problem with Educational Diversity

While diversity in American higher education has received a substantial amount of comment, among the last of the problems to be noted are those it creates for the prospective student. He faces a bewildering number of institutions of varying kind and quality. Even if he knows

clearly what he is looking for (and most evidence shows this is exceptional), he is often not sure where to look for it or even knows when he may have found it. The heart of the problem is to match the diverse interests, abilities and circumstances of the student with a corresponding set of facilities, programs, and compatible institutional characteristics. Presumably colleges and universities might do much more to dissipate the confusion by being themselves clearer about and setting forth more fully the distinctive character of their particular institutions. The fact that this has not been sufficiently well done has contributed, at least, to the growth of independent college selection publications and services approaching in size the proportions of a small industry. Perhaps independent guidance is the best solution, but administrators cannot ignore the problems which such guidance seeks to solve.

Here is an excellent statement of the problem involving institutions and students.

> There are more than 2,000 institutions in the United States that call themselves college or university. Some of them rank among the greatest centers of higher learning in the world; others do not bear comparison with good high schools. Some cost a great deal to attend, others (including some of the best) almost nothing. Some are church-affiliated, some are secular; some offer only the liberal arts; others are essentially trade schools.
>
> With such numbers and diversity, it is not enough to conclude that there is some place for almost everybody who wants to go to college. The fact is that there are <u>several</u> some places for almost everybody. The interesting question then becomes: why does this student want to go to that college?
>
> There are a few obvious determinants--academic aptitude and achievement, ability to pay, geography--but they are not exclusive. Even students of low ability have a fair number of choices among public and private institutions; those of average or high ability have an even larger choice. The same is true of cost. There are a lot of inexpensive schools and a lot of expensive ones, and even within one school there are students from families with wide variation in income. As for geography, most Americans do tend to go to a college in their own state and

> within the state, to an institution in the area where they live. But the lines of demarcation are not neat. While a public urban institution may draw its students almost exclusively from the city in which it is located, the pool of potential recruits for a religious college is composed primarily of communicants of that faith. And some colleges have a national clientele.*

The prospective student, faced with what on the surface seem infinite choices, finds that the dominance of any one factor in his choice quickly narrows the field. Suppose, for example, a male student wishes to attend a university as against a college; his choices have been reduced from some 1600 (excluding women's colleges, of course, from the total of 2100) to not more than 200. If he adds the factor of private as against public institutions his choices have again been reduced by half. Or suppose he prefers a school for men as against a coeducational school, again his choices have been limited, and if he wishes it to be a university for men as against a college for men, he will be limited to a very small number indeed.

So far as the prospective student is concerned, this pluralism in higher education is at once his opportunity and his despair. It offers wonderful choices, but finding the exact combination of possibilities and preferences is a personal puzzle. Actually, the problem is resolved for him more frequently than he resolves it for himself by factors beyond his control--money, admission policies, his previous academic record, distance and the like--but within the limits of his discretion the diversity of institutions is a painful reality.

Diversity in Higher Education as an Administrative Problem

Diversity in higher education is a problem for the administrators, faculties and boards of control of each individual institution. It is they who must create the characteristics which make their college or university distinctive, and it is their responsibility to maintain the distinctions with consistency. This is not easy to do. Individuality must not be eccentricity, yet it must be dis-

---

* "The Invisible Thread: A University's Reputation," Carnegie Corporation of New York Quarterly. January, 1966.

tinctive and must be worth maintaining. Take, for example, the problem of women's colleges. There is scarcely a women's college in the country today which, given the pressures of the college-seeking population, would not find some of its strains--finances, faculty recruitment, curriculum--eased if it became co-educational. The problem of maintaining its institutional distinction is clear: is the matter of educating women in a separate institution sufficiently important to justify the maintenance of this particular characteristic? If the answer is yes, a whole series of policies must be maintained all of which are based upon an educational conviction. The price, so to speak, of such distinction must be paid. From the widespread tendency to make separate education for the sexes a pro forma matter in schools which are still designated as primarily for men or women it is evident that there is less and less interest in maintaining this particular distinction.

In some respect every institution is faced, in some degree, with the same problem. It must maintain its "identity." This a continuing problem for those responsible for maintaining the "image" of a particular college or university. Whatever makes the church-related institution, the men's school, the private university distinguishable must be a major concern of the administrators. If it is lost, their reason for being is seriously impaired.

The difficulty of maintaining a sense of institutional distinction has been greatly increased by the recent development of powerful economic and intellectual forces in American life which tend to impose uniformity. These growing forces, to put it bluntly, can make life miserable for the college or university which wishes to preserve its institutional individuality.

An exhaustive analysis of the impact of these forces upon the diversity of American higher education is far too intricate to be undertaken here. One widespread educational dilemma will serve as an illustration. This is the problem which faces higher education as a whole--colleges as well as universities--as to how to accommodate and reconcile the mutual claims of both teaching and research upon the time and resources of the academic community. The comparatively recent expansion of research has grown out of an amazing transformation in American social and academic life. It has not been confined to any segment of society nor to any group of institutions. Its incorporation into higher education has been accompanied by controversy and confusion. The college, traditionally devoted to teaching, has found it necessary to

make adjustments of a fundamental kind. Universities, which have thought of themselves as primarily occupied with research, now find themselves also faced with teaching responsibilities of the first magnitude. How can the distinctive "character" of colleges and universities, under such changing circumstances, be maintained?

Thus the problems which are rooted in the diversity of institutions of higher education are becoming more and more evident. It has become more difficult for institutions to maintain distinctions and at the same time accommodate the more nearly uniform demands which are emerging. The temptation for administrators to yield to the pressures of uniformity--to keep up with the Joneses--is strong. In part, it is countered by a corresponding restiveness which conformity itself generates.

Diversity in American higher education has great values. If these values are to be maintained it will be done only through deliberate effort. Administrators will have to become more fully aware of the distinctive character of their particular institutions and more knowledgeable as to the educational practices and forms of organization compatible with them. A religious school is not a secular one; a liberal arts college is not a university. "Higher education" is by no means a unit and our interest in establishing broad generalizations about it must not obscure that fact. Understanding the differences between institutions is an important key to successful administration.

II

THE SOCIAL STUDIES AND ADMINISTRATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

It has long been accepted that the college and university administrator can derive great benefit from a substantial exposure to the social studies. The point to be made here, however, is that the administration of higher education is less a matter for educators who have studied the social sciences, than it is the province of the social sciences themselves and is, therefore, properly the study of social scientists.

If higher education had remained confined to the campus, it might also have remained a field of study confined to educators. When institutions of higher learning, however, become deeply involved, in fact, become indispensable, to social and political activities ranging from national defense to programs of poverty, mental health, and public entertainment, they need for their proper development and administration the understanding and aid of economists, sociologists, scientists, psychologists and a host of other specializations. It is the purpose of this section of our discussion to suggest ways of looking at problems in higher education so that there may be enlisted in their solution the techniques and knowledge of scholars who have previously been only casually concerned.*

The topics which have been chiefly discussed in the study of administration have been those which force themselves upon the attention of the campus-oriented administrator. Naturally emerging from the operations of institutions themselves, such topics run along these lines: (1) students, (2) faculty, (3) organization and administration, (4) curriculum, (5) research, (6) finance, (7) public relations, and (8) boards of control. Of course these are categories in which campus administrators see their problems, but studies about them,

---

* Actually social scientists have moved far toward the recognition of education in general, and of higher education in particular, as proper fields for research and interpretation. A particularly important and pertinent contribution is: D. E. Tope, The Social Sciences View School Administration, (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965).

cast in these familiar forms, seem no longer either adequate or exciting. Continued study in such forms seems to add little to our depth of understanding. In the evolution of higher education, there would appear to be overtones of social meaning and administrative consequences not fully captured in such formalized study.

The Need for New Concepts

What is the possibility of finding or devising new ways of organizing study and research in the administration of higher education around what might be called concepts of meaning and purpose, rather than those of operations, and which would employ techniques of analysis and interpretation as well as those of description and tabulation? Perhaps there are new possibilities arising from the growing magnitude of higher education. Normally anything which grows in mass, grows in complexity. A single family, for example, voluntarily moving from one location to another is no particular social problem, but an urban renewal program, requiring the simultanious and forcible removal of a hundred families puts demands on every social service and requires far different treatment. The same kinds of problems are emerging in higher education with the growing number of institutions, their increasing diversity and their swelling populations.

A second hope for finding fresh viewpoints from which to profit in the study of administration arises from our ability to see, under new circumstances, old problems and even old data in a new light. If one stares at a familiar picture long enough or from slightly different angles, new images begin to appear. The casting of old problems into new forms can sometimes be the means of bringing to bear upon them fresh information and new methods of attack. If, for example, one asks, "What is the purpose of education?", old and well-tried generalizations will immediately be advanced. If, however, one asks, "What accounts for the current upsurge of demand for education?", one has asked substantially the same question, but now a whole new set of considerations can be brought to bear upon the answer. The one question may be inherently no more fertile than the other, but the one has the capacity to encourage a variety of research which the other does not. If the administrative problems of higher education, familiar to educators, could be recast into forms and concepts with which the social sciences are familiar, the results could be highly beneficial.

The Economics of Educational "Demand"

Suppose one attempts to state the general query of why people seek higher education in a term familiar to economists as the "demand" for education. Demand is, for economists, one of their oldest and most complex concepts. It appears to be susceptible to innumerable methods of analysis and treatment. It is suggested that what economists have done with the concept of demand in the realm of trade, they can also do in the area of education with interest and profit to both fields.

Suppose someone asks, "Does the United States have too many college graduates?" The answer usually given to the question is, "No." At any rate, the country is constantly pressing for more, and seeking to upgrade those it has. India, by contrast, with its relatively small number of college graduates from its huge population, has too many. Here is a paradox. Why does the United States with so many college graduates have too few and India with so few college graduates have too many? What are the factors in the respective countries which create the demand for education? Cast in this form the problem is not only one for educators, but for the economist, political scientist, sociologist, and government planner.

In the Philippine Islands, there are literally thousands being educated as lawyers in a country which is crying for engineers, agricultural experts, psychologists, and doctors. The phenomenon is observable in other countries, such as Italy and Spain. What creates the demand for lawyers in countries where they are not needed? Education in the United States may be different, but it can profit from the same kind of analysis. Obviously, whatever answers are adduced from such investigations have profound importance for educational planning and administration and for all kinds of relevant forecasting.

The study of other aspects of educational demand, would be equally challenging. To what extent can educational demand be consciously affected by governmental policies or by other kinds and sources of social planning? How many more people might a country or its educational institutions induce to study English literature, physics, or theology, for example, by taking specific measures to induce them to do so, and what could such specific inducements be? The answers to such questions are complex, but they are of the utmost importance to the planning of educational facilities.

Higher Education as an Investment

The economist is in a particularly good position to assist higher education, and the public in general, to understand the relationship between the value of education and economic productivity. To what extent is education an actual economic investment? It is frequently said that every dollar invested in education returns itself many times over. The view is taken that educated people produce more and consume more--they read more, travel more, take better care of their health, etc., than do uneducated people. Moreover, it is pointed out in support of educational expenditures that, the lifetime incomes of high school and college graduates are far greater than those of less well-educated people. The combination of these views results in the exuberant conclusion that the more we spend on education, the greater the direct benefits will be to everyone concerned. Some have even argued that so great is the value of education we should provide education free in earlier years and collect from individuals later.

Economists know that this argument is a little too facile; there are many other factors to be considered.* At the same time, it can be confidently said that education does contribute to the production of wealth; the problem is to find out how much and in what way. Out of such studies should come better bases on which to establish policies for determining levels of educational expenditures. Such studies should also contribute materially to a more equitable determination of who should pay for what and when.

Higher Education as a Business Enterprise

Another area of prime importance for the talents of economists and students of business administration is to be found in the treatment of colleges and universities as business enterprises. This has become of increasing importance as a result of the change in the economic order of magnitude of higher education. It is a truism that institutions of

---

* See A. Daniere, Higher Education in the American Economy, (New York, Random House, 1965). Also, Seymour Harris has written or edited a number of books on the economics of education. See especially, Higher Education in the United States: The Economic Problems (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), and Education and Public Policy (Berkeley, Calif: McCutchan Pub. Co., 1965).

higher learning have become "big business," that through them now pours a substantial portion of the national income. Individual institutions have annual budgets that rival those of major corporations in amount, and exceed many in complexity. Of course, concepts of efficiency in colleges and universities vary from those of business enterprises. Expenditures are not calculated nor justified on the same bases. Thus, a department of archaeology may cost $100,000 a year without a dollar in return, and may still be regarded as a useful expenditure. Nevertheless, a thoroughly "business" point of view may be very valuable to help a university determine whether it has "bought" with the money spent for archaeology all the archaeology that might be bought.

Furthermore, institutions of higher learning actually reveal many of the same characteristics as business enterprises. Problems of competition and monopoly are not unrelated to colleges and universities so far as faculty, student, and financial support are concerned. Efforts have been made, generally feeble, to establish cooperation between institutions in an effort to reduce expenses or increase educational efficiency. Why isn't there more cooperation between educational institutions? What factors stand in the way? Economists might even look at colleges and universities under the heading of public utilities--supplying services, now indispensable and universal, at rates compatible with public interest, for services of standard quality. Problems of this kind have been under review by economists for many years and in other fields have brought out volumes of fact and have resulted in improved policies. In short, it seems clear that there are places where the administration of higher education can profit from the practices and concepts of business management. Such areas as raising money, the investment and use of endowment funds, purchasing, the management of labor, and the like all bear resemblances to the practices of business and yet require specialized treatment for purposes of education. There is much business management to be applied to the management of education, even though there are many differences between the enterprises.*

There is much in the area of business administration which can be applied to the study of efficiency in education-

---

* T. L. Hungate, Management in Higher Education, (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964) is a good treatise in this area.

al processes themselves. The equation of time, students, courses, space, and teachers can be balanced in many ways. The outcome may have an effect, not only upon the use of money and men, but on the effectiveness of learning itself. Large lecture sessions versus independent study versus investment in television equipment are choices a conscientious administrator must ponder. Personal speculations and preferences are not a sufficient base for administration if more factual studies of efficiency can be devised. The point is that the techniques of business administration to a very large extent can be applied to the operations of colleges and universities to their great advantage.

Higher Education as Political Science

The more nearly higher education becomes involved in the political and social activities of society, the more nearly it becomes a field of study for the political scientist. This arises, in part, from the number and variety of relationships between governments, at all levels, and the colleges and universities. These relationships are of the utmost importance not only to the operations of the governments involved, but also to the operation of the educational institutions. For example, it might well be asked even now, as to what extent, as a result of all the federal relationships, higher education has been transformed into an instrumentality of national policy. There have been developments in the nature and magnitude of operations which justify such a question. It is true that the problem has received considerable attention, but its development is so swift and its form so varied that much more investigation is both possible and desirable.

Colleges and universities have themselves become organizations in which the classic problems of political science now clearly appear. Such problems are those of authority and freedom, checks and balances, instrumentalities of control, influences in decision-making, representation and the like. Individual studies have described the roles of faculties, students, boards of control, but no real coordination and clarification of the whole have been achieved. Students complain there is no genuine recognition of their rights as "consumers." Faculties insist that they do and must control the curriculum. Boards of control say they determine "institutional policy"; the legislature and governor set the budget of public institutions; and, the president is usually an uncomfortable officer standing among all the parties at interest. The government of institutions of higher learning

is full of contradictions, and paralyzing oppositions occur too often. Many of the tensions of universities come from the lack of clarity in the allocation and use of authority. What arrangements of authority can help avoid conflict and facilitate action? By what means can the "general will" be discovered and put into operation? If university problems are cast in the form of political problems, the student of government need look no further for a laboratory.

The Study of Educational Bureaucracy

One of the areas in which the political scientist should be greatly interested is the growth, in institutions of higher learning, of bureaucracy and its effect upon their operation. Institutions have not only grown in size, they have grown in complexity. They own complicated machines and expensive real estate. They require the services and almost every skill to be found in business. The non-academic staff is frequently larger than the instructional staff. All of this has resulted in a multiplication of routines, organization, and machinery, on the one hand essential to the management of a large enterprise and, on the other, paralyzing to its spirit. The organization of the academic year into semesters and quarters has resulted in an enormous amount of "academic accounting" - courses, credit hours, calculation of teaching loads, endless forms and reports about grades and registration, majors, minors, transfers, student advising, withholding taxes, and retirement problems. To the faculty, the bureaucracy is an irritation; to the institution, it is a necessity. Academic business requires organization and an organization exalts routines and standardization. It represses spontaneity. Furthermore, the growth of bureaucracy multiplies offices and officers. It establishes and hardens authority and status with resulting concern about protocol and administrative channels.

The student of political science can watch on the campus the development of many of the same problems he has studied in government. What he has found out about these things, their dangers and benefits in the operation of governments, he can bring to bear upon the development of higher education.

Psychology, Sociology and History

What has been sketched so broadly in areas in the administration of higher education for economics and political science can be as fully developed for psychology, sociology

and history. For each of these fields, higher education is a rich field for study. And higher education needs, in turn, the contributions that can be made to it by the psychologists, sociologists and historians. For example, perhaps no area should give the administrator in higher education more concern than that of determining the quality of the education which his institution provides. It is in the very nature of education that every aspect of its operations should constantly improve. But how is the quality of education to be assessed and how is that improvement to be brought about?* To what factors should the administrator give most attention? Of course, the psychologists have been enormously busy with the operations of almost every aspect of higher education. The difficulty is that their results are so nearly the product of the size, time, place, and nature of their immediate materials for study that the mirror they hold up to higher education can never reflect the same image very long. But the contributions they make in enabling higher education to see itself is an indispensable one.

The expansion of higher education into the areas of general public service has put higher education on the very doorstep of the sociologists. Almost every facet of society is affected by the degree and character of education which bears upon it - crime, poverty, population, social characteristics. But now, higher education itself is part of the social phenomena; it is another and major animal in the sociologists' game preserve, one which has its effect on all others.**

No area of sociology has received more attention in recent years than the study of population. The growth and movement of population, especially as reflected in urban phenomena, have attracted particular attention. The interaction of higher education with these aspects of population studies has not, of course, been overlooked, but much remains to be done. Much of the future planning of higher education will be

---

* David Riesman, "Some Problems in Assessing(and Improving) the Quality of a College" in Seymour Harris (ed.) Higher Education in the United States: The Economic Problem (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), pp. 173-177.

**An excellent survey, although now somewhat dated is: Orville G. Brim, Jr., Sociology in the Field of Education (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1958).

affected by population patterns, and in that area the sociologist and the administrator in higher education will find themselves almost as one in the identity of their concerns.

The perspective of history is, perhaps, the one thing which the administrator in higher education today may find most helpful in his efforts to understand the swirling activities about him. Administrators have been so preoccupied with the pressures and anxieties of current problems of expansion and adjustment that they are inclined to see their problems as new and unique. Some problems are, but many are not.

There is for example, nothing quite so salutary as to bring to bear upon a curriculum problem the accounting of history. A debate about the modification of a college entrance requirement can be effectively influenced by a review of what was at one time, but is no longer, required. Similarly, one of the great contributions to the administrator beset with problems of academic freedom is to be found in the historical perspective provided by Hofstadter and Metzger, The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States. Likewise, the history of the land-grant colleges can contribute more to the "positioning" of a college with regard to a public service policy than a whole file of current statistics.*

If it is true, as someone has said, that our society is becoming one vast school, it would follow that institutions of higher learning are becoming more integral parts of that society. The social sciences which address themselves to the study of society must now include higher education as one of their own fields for exploration.

---

* One of the historical interpretations of American higher education is in a recently published book by L. R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965).

III

EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

At first glance it may seem strange that philosophy should be a major factor in the successful administration of higher education. Actually, perhaps the most important qualification an administrator can bring to his job is a philosophy of education, i.e., some clear ideas as to why the institution exists, for whom it is trying to provide education, and what kind of education it is trying to provide. Such a philosophy is in the foreground or the background of almost every educational decision. It is basic to admission policies, to the selection of faculty and to the determination of the curriculum.

Every college or university exists because of some educational convictions. New colleges continually arise because someone believes that there are those who are not now getting an education, or enough education, or the kind of education they should have. As a result, there come into being such diverse institutions as the land grant universities, Bennington College, Catholic University of America, and countless others. Administrators in such institutions can be successful only when they understand the educational convictions on which the institution is founded and see to it that these are observed.

Even more fundamental than the convictions upon which a particular institution are founded are the underlying political and social conceptions which are accepted by the general public. These the administrator must understand. All higher education shapes itself in accordance with these basic social and ethical agreements. Where higher education in America at one time had an essentially ethical or even religious end in view, now its exposition is almost entirely in terms of utilitarianism--the competence required in order that people may operate socially, economically, politically. The most potent appeal to students and potential students these days is in terms of income advantage, and the most potent appeal to the public for educational support is that education is a sound economic investment.

Over the long run, the generally agreed upon sentiments in the American society determine what goes on and will go on

in higher education.* Just now, the American people seem to be agreed that public higher education must: (1) be democratic, that is, open to all who can profit by it; (2) be as inexpensive to the student as possible; (3) provide for the broad interests of society--practical and vocational as well as cultural; and (4) that public education, at least, must be free from the control of special interests or groups. These sentiments or agreements do not automatically translate themselves into administrative decisions. It is up to the administrator to see that his institution is managed in such a way as to incorporate these basic sentiments into administrative actions and educational policies. This he cannot do unless he has studied them enough to recognize them when they appear and has had sufficient training in analysis to deal with them.

The admission policy of any institution is actually an administrative decision about a philosophical question, namely, "who is to receive an education at this particular institution?" It is a part of a still broader problem, "who is entitled to higher education at all?" Most discussions of admissions are soon embroiled in a question of whether education is to devote itself to the selection of the few or service to the many.

Sometimes one finds this issue discussed under the concept of "waste." Europeans profess to be appalled at the waste in the American educational system. They point to its expensive efforts to accommodate vast numbers of students, to its lack of discrimination in their selection, and to the distressingly high rate of dropout. But this is only one conception of waste. Can it not also be regarded as waste in an educational system when that system excludes from exposure to higher education many students whose talents are otherwise never discovered? In any comparative study of waste in different kinds of educational systems, the problem can appear in a thousand forms in the daily operations of higher education, and the successful administrator must be able to recognize it and to deal with it.

Nor should administrators think that the study of educational philosophy is too vague and general for practical use. The fact is that philosophy will be called upon in almost every phase of his work - in answering his mail, in faculty conferences, in public addresses, in dealing with students. Philosophical discussions can arise over the

---

* Sidney Hook, Education for Modern Man (New York: The Dial Press, 1946), chapter 4.

question of whether there should be policemen on the campus, or over control of the student newspaper, or whether a college should give outright scholarships or encourage students to borrow money for their education.

Administration as Interpretation

A second major interest of the administrator in educational philosophy is that it enables him to do his work through persuasion rather than by the use of power. Much has been made of administration through decision-making, but not enough has been made of interpretation. Institutions of higher learning are extremely complex organizations. It is astounding how little they are understood even by the faculty, administrators, and students who collectively operate them. The task of the administrator is much less frequently to make a decision than it is to explain to parties at interest <u>why</u> the nature of the institution requires certain policies and <u>why</u> certain kinds of regulations have been established. Frequently, when such interpretations have been made, decisions become unnecessary; explanation is enough. The task of interpretation, however, is a perpetual one because every year the makeup of those groups for whom interpretations must be made--students, faculty, administrators, and the general public--changes.

It may be said that administration of higher education is nine-tenths <u>explanation</u>. Students want to know why certain subjects are required in the curriculum, faculty want to know why the teaching load is so heavy and salaries so low, the alumni want to know why their children are not automatically admitted to the institution, and the public wants to know why it all costs so much. To explain all of these things is in the day's work for the administrator, but they are not "decisions." They are interpretations, and unless he can make them well there will be trouble; if he can make them well, there will be less trouble.

One may take, for example, one widespread misconception among students in higher education. Students have been told by administrators, college presidents, public relations departments, and even by faculty, that universities exist to "serve them." Students accept this literally, in the same way the phrase is used in the commercial world, namely, that the "customer is always right." With this conception bred into them by their earlier experiences and reassured by the interpretation given by administrators, students are inclined to demand that what they do not like should be changed. If

it is not changed, they feel betrayed. Actually, the difficulty is a self-created misunderstanding.

The problem arises from a misunderstanding as to the nature of institutions, particularly universities, and the purposes they serve. No university belongs to the people who operate it or to the students who attend it; their benefit and convenience are only incidental to its purpose. So far as students are concerned, they attend it for the purpose of enlisting in the cause for which the university exists, namely, the battle against ignorance. For students to say that a university is "theirs," that it "belongs to them," arises from a natural interpretation of what they have been led to believe. A university no more belongs to students than an army belongs to its recruits, or than a church belongs to those who happen to attend it at a certain time. No amount of decision-making or legislation will get at problems of this sort. Unless the administrator has explanations and can make them, he will be in trouble.

There are whole areas in the operation of higher education the philosophical bases of which have not been sufficiently explored. This does not mean that the administrator must make every matter a subject of philosophical discussion, but it does mean that the role of the administrator as a philosophical interpreter is absolutely essential.

Federal Aid as a Problem of Educational Philosophy

Recent legislation providing federal aid to education at all levels and in unprecedented volume has subjected traditional educational and social viewpoints to re-examination and to profound readjustments.* Legislation enacted between 1961 and 1965 made provision for a wide variety of programs. Several deserve enumeration as indicating the range of adjustment to which colleges and universities and their administrators have had to subject themselves philosophically, as well as in their daily operations. One act provides for direct, outright scholarship grants for needy students. Another provides long-term loans, at low interest rates, for as much as $1000 a year for undergraduates and up to $1500 a year for graduate students. To students in certain professional schools even higher loans will be available, in private as well as in public institutions. Generous fellowships will be

---

* John W. Gardner, "Government and the Universities," in Logan Wilson (ed.), Emerging Patterns of Higher Education (Washington: American Council on Education, 1965), p. 286-291.

available in a number of fields for teachers who wish to study for advanced degrees. Colleges will also be able to offer work-study programs for students from low-income families. Help to institutions is also provided--funds for the construction or expansion of various kinds of facilities and to help "developing" colleges to improve their academic programs.

Research funds are likewise available in larger amounts and in more fields, and money to help colleges establish and expand public service activities in such areas as the elimination of poverty and the improvement of employment, health, housing and special educational curricula. Welfare programs, such as "Headstart" for underprivileged children, Vista as a domestic aid enterprise, and the National Teachers Corps to work in schools in poor areas are parts of sweeping federal interventions in education. And the end is by no means in sight.

These developments have stimulated educational activity throughout the country as it has never been stimulated before. Education is now incorporated into a range of social activities to which it has previously been only distantly related. Traditional views of the nature and uses of education have had to be revised. Experimentation and improvement have been among the results produced, but so have controversy and confusion.

Gradually, new questions of educational philosophy have emerged and the answers have forced administrative adjustments. Perhaps most of the adjustments can be summarized by saying that they arise from the fact that education in addition to its traditional role has become an agency of social welfare. For example, it is accepted now that not only is "schooling," i.e. education, an individual and social good, but that attending school, quite aside from personal educational benefits, is a social good in itself as an antidote to unemployment and delinquency. Indeed, many of the federal programs are based less upon the usefulness of education as traditionally conceived than upon the schools as instrumentalities for solving other important economic and social problems.

These developments are forcing changes in the thoughts, feelings and daily practices of administrators of higher education everywhere. Educational issues such as those involving church and state, public expenditures for private institutions, and the determination of the proper sphere of educational activities have been blurred. Administration has become less and less a process of decision and more and more one of accommodation to external pressures and forces. Educa-

tional philosophy is no longer distinguishable from a general amorphous social philosophy without clear boundary lines. Whether or not these developments are good is beside the point. What is important is for administrators and students of administration to apply the sharp tools of intellectual analysis to the entire situation and to apply their conclusions vigorously in the discharge of their responsibilities.

Administration as an Art

It has been said that administration is more art than science, meaning, perhaps, that after all has been said about organization, authority, delegation of authority, and span of control which can be said, the effectiveness of administration is determined more by the manner in which it is carried on than by any other factor. Sometimes one encounters effective administration with almost no system and sometimes the most pretentious system is in constant turmoil. Administration then is certainly more than organization. It is art; it is human relations; it is wisdom and virtue, as well as the exercise of power.*

It is the purpose in this brief discussion to point out a number of things about how the exercise of administrative authority influences its effectiveness. Perhaps the most important way, as it is one most often noted, is the manner and volume of "communication." It has already been pointed out that explanation is perhaps the most extensive and the most continuous function of the educational administrator. In order, however, to explain anything, the persons involved must be informed. That people on a campus or anywhere else are informed or will take the trouble to inform themselves is something which cannot be taken for granted. Faculties, for example, are busy and preoccupied; they are always faced with more than they can read. The administrator who expects that information conveyed by general announcements and memoranda will be sufficient will be doomed to disappointment. In addition to the basic responsibility of being clear, brief and precise in conveying information, the successful administrator must devise varied ways of communicating information so that it will penetrate the defenses of those to whom it is addressed. A popular American magazine used to issue a directive to its staff suggesting that, so

---

* Some of these views are well illustrated and discussed in Henry M. Wriston, Academic Procession (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959).

far as its readers were concerned, they should "never underestimate their intelligence, nor overestimate their information." It is not bad advice for the administrator in higher education.

A second factor which influences the effectiveness of the administrator is the manner in which he exercises his authority. This factor is virtually a part of the administrator's own personality. "Mind your manners" may be good advice for children and adults generally; it is indispensable for administrators. Relationships involving authority or which have overtones of superiority and subordination beget sensitivities very quickly and academic people probably suffer from more than their share of sensitivity. Clarity and decisiveness are highly desirable characteristics of good administrators, but their value is enhanced by tact, courtesy and consideration. The exercise of power has all too often a corrosive effect on the personalities of administrators not the least of which is a blindness as to the impact of their words and actions. A college president who publicly refers to "my" faculty or "my" deans will unnecessarily put teeth on edge--people do not like to be referred to, even figuratively, as chattels. Perhaps the best evidence for the utility of manner in administration is that rare but admiring observation which is occasionally made about some administrators, "He can say 'no' and make them like it."

A question which deserves more attention than it has received thus far is, "how much 'administration' can a faculty undertake?" The question is based on the assumption that administration is a process for disposing of things. Are there, then, areas which in this sense a faculty can administer? In general, there appear to be many things in which faculties are involved but few in which they alone exercise administrative authority. Here, however, definitions are difficult to make, and the importance of faculty participation is scarcely to be measured by the simple formula of whether they have sole power to dispose of certain matters. If there are faculty committees, meetings, and discussions, there will be faculty influence on the outcome of administrative decisions no matter what authority may be designated as final. In addition to the wisdom which may accrue from faculty consideration of a wide range of academic matters, the exercise of administrative authority will be greatly facilitated because their participation will enhance faculty understanding and acceptance.

Administrative effectiveness grows not through knowledge of organization and bylaws so much as through experience and

skill in the intangible factors of human relations. It is this kind of difference which distinguishes artists in any field, the subtle distinctions which, for administrators, may make the difference between success and failure. Administrators need not and should not try to imitate each other as "artists" but they can learn from each other, and their art should always be the subject of observation and reflection.

IV

CRISIS AND CONTINUITY IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

In translating viewpoints about administration into actual programs of study and application, there are two broad but not necessarily mutually exclusive groups of problems. The first groups consists of the crisis problems of American higher education thrust upon it by the immediate necessity to accommodate new and expanding responsibilities. These responsibilities are the upsurge of student enrollment, the expansion of research, and the development of new and demanding programs of public service. These developments have come with such a rush that the efforts to deal with them have become an obsession with both administrators and faculty. The current crisis grows out of urgency--a vast increase in the number of students for whom time will not wait, and the lag inherent in providing the necessary facilities--money, plant and trained faculty. The situation is like the old dilemma of hunger which must be satisfied at once, and crops that are slow in reaching harvest.

The second group of problems for administrative study and research are what may be called the continuing problems of higher education, those which persist through periods of both quiet and stress. They are inherent in the establishment of the purposes and processes of education and in appraising its results. They are the basic and important aspects of education, but under the present circumstances of American life they have had to be temporarily subordinated to the problem of meeting immediate and urgent demands.

Of all the claims on the time and attention of college and university administrators, that of meeting the growing instructional requirements is currently the most critical. From now until 1971 at least, each year will see a substantial increase in enrollment, each year will see fewer dropouts, each year will see a larger proportion of students remaining for graduate work and seeking admission to professional schools.* The recruitment of faculty, the control of curriculum, the invention of instructional methods and modes of organization will be the major preoccupation of higher

---

* NEA Research Bulletin, 44(2), May, 1966.

education. It will be the major preoccupation because along with the instruction of students goes the equally urgent problems of housing and feeding them. The "population problem" in a variety of forms is already here so far as colleges and universities are concerned.

Different in character but in some respects just as urgent is the enormous expansion of research activities in American higher education. This expansion is a complex phenomenon and its administrative accommodation is as difficult as it is insistent. The great expansion of knowledge, which is a recent development, has itself made more research possible and with that possibility has come a growing interest in its pursuit. The pursuit of knowledge has always been an integral part of higher education, but never before has it absorbed so much time and energy as it does now. Indeed, research has become not only a separate field of activity but also a method of instruction pervading all fields. It occupies high priority among the pursuits of a country bent on higher standards of welfare and on defending itself against external threats. But the incorporation of expanding research activities into colleges and universities, at just the time they are straining to accommodate huge additions to their instructional loads, requires reallocation of limited resources of time, money and space. It has also created types of educational strain illustrated, as has already been said, by the constant necessity for reconciling the respective claims of teaching and research. Likewise, the social and philosophical implications in the assumption that everything is properly a subject for research have not yet been fully appreciated. As that appreciation grows, its effect upon established knowledge, authority and institutions will inevitably receive more consideration.

The third of the critical areas in higher education at present is the vast expansion of its responsibility for public service. These activities have gradually increased as a result of the public's discovery of how useful colleges and universities are. They have come to serve a great variety of purposes far beyond the traditions of formal education, ranging from providing public entertainment to the sponsorship of personnel training programs for defense and public welfare. This expansion of the utilitarian value of the institutions of higher education goes on steadily. The more nearly society is operated on the basis of knowledge, carefully gathered and impersonally applied, the more nearly the processes of higher education and of social action coincide, and the more nearly the processes of public administration

and of legislation become those of the academic community. Society is becoming one vast school.

These developments have important educational consequences. The more nearly society becomes one great school, that is, the more nearly government and business utilize and depend upon the expertise of the academic community, the more nearly do people in colleges and universities become interchangeable parts in our society. They are now almost as much at home off the campus as on it. A new pattern of academic success and of administration follows. For example, a major university may now frequently provide for the absence of as many as one-third of the members of some of its departments at a given time. New conceptions of work and of management inevitably result.

Educational Quality

The critical problems of higher education growing out of immediate pressures, and necessary adjustments to them, are currently dominant claims upon the attention of administrators. There is no escaping them. Yet, there are longer range aspects of higher education which, if less insistent, are no less important and which may be actually influenced or disposed of by the steps taken to meet more urgent problems. One of these longer range concerns is that of educational quality. Maintaining the quality of education is a continuing responsibility. In fact, the responsibility is not merely one of maintaining but of improving quality, for inherent in the very concept of education is the notion of improving everything, including itself.

Yet quality in higher education is itself a by-product of a combination of factors--faculty, students, facilities and dozens of intangibles. Actually, the quality of education may very well be determined by incidental decisions--decisions which may have been made with little thought as to their impact upon quality. Thus, the necessity to "cover classes" could easily result in hiring teachers whose training is more limited than would be desirable, and the admission of students of lower quality out of a desire to render a social service can result in a deterioration of educational quality.

Quality in education is far more easily destroyed than improved. To improve quality means to raise it above the level which has currently been achieved and this requires time and unremitting effort. It can be done only by the improvement of factors out of which quality emerges--the

greater dedication of students, the improved training and/or increased efforts of the faculty, or of other relevant factors. The improvement of quality always requires conscious effort. Its deterioration can come about merely through inattention or preoccupation with details of institutional management. Deterioration can be accelerated by destroying the equation among the elements out of which educational quality comes, as for example, the admission of too many students for a given number of faculty or a given amount of space.

Quality is perhaps one of the characteristics of education most difficult to define and measure, yet it should be the one about which the administrators should be continuously concerned. Unless decisions are taken with their impact upon quality in mind, the administration of a college or university can become an operation more aptly described as accommodation. Even so, under critical conditions, adjustments facing institutions must often be made without reference to some of their incidental effects. The challenge to the administrator who places quality high on the list of his educational values is how to incorporate the critical and necessary adjustments into a program which will have the least adverse effects upon quality.

There are other major aspects of higher education which can be affected permanently as a consequence of incidental adjustments to immediate pressures. One of these is the matter of what is happening to the academic profession itself. The factors which have molded the profession so far as admission to its membership, its traditions and its conditions of work are concerned, are being altered. What will be some of the effects? What will be the consequences if, for example, unionization grows, if faculty salaries become substantially higher than those of government and business, if the tendency grows to obtain independent sources for research support, if tenure rules are substantially modified, or if students are allowed a role in choosing faculties? What underlying conceptions of education now operate to hold the profession within a certain orbit and what would be the results if these forces seek a different equilibrium?

One of the continuing problems of higher education which is also bound to be affected by the readjustments to changing conditions is that of its control. The control of higher education is a complex phenomenon, but the question of control is also crucial and nothing will better reward research and study. Factors which operate to control higher education are numerous and disparate in character. They may range from the

intangible social "climate" of the particular environment in which education is carried on, to the hard and definite provisions for legal supervision and finance. Controls can be direct, such as those imposed by boards and legislatures, or they can be indirect, such as those arising from public relations. The variety of influences which have some part in the control of higher education and which affect every aspect of its operations, are generated both within and outside institutions and can be so subtle as to defy identification. The subject is a vast area for investigation by students of administration.*

Another fruitful area for study concerns the acceptance of grants from independent sources for research. Such grants have become, for many institutions, a major source of support. More and more programs of public service and even of instruction are coming to rely upon such sources. What are the implications for the control of higher education where this is true? The whole of higher education is aware of the problem, but its form, subtlety, and changing character demand continuing review. It may be assumed that every research grant is a kind of promissory note whose terms must eventually be met. It is an investment on the part of a government, an institution, a foundation, or an individual which requires an assurance of return of some kind, and the recipient must make corresponding adjustments to see that he "delivers." This may be no worse, indeed it may be better, than some other forms of control to which higher education is subject, but, whether better or worse, it is at least different from those which have prevailed in the past and must be kept under scrutiny.

Thus, both the crucial and the continuing problems with which administration in higher education must deal are attracting increasing attention. The number of thoughtful and useful analyses is growing, experiments are being tried. Conditions, however, change so rapidly that study and reassessment must be continuous. The purpose here is to list in some organized way some of the major topics to which administrators and students of administration should continue to address themselves. While the urgent problems of adjustment in higher education are by no means separable from the

---

* A good discussion of the complexities of control will be found in R.F. Campbell, et al., The Organization and Control of American Schools (Columbus, Ohio: C.E. Merrill, 1965).

longer range considerations, for purposes of management and discussion they can be classified separately. It is hoped that such a classification will be useful.

Critical Problems in the Administration of Higher Education

A. The Expanded Instructional Load and Some of Its Consequences
   1. The college-going population--its size.
   2. The diversity of the college-going population--its social and economic composition; its racial and religious composition; distribution by sex; urban-rural distribution.
   3. The institutional distribution of the instructional load--community colleges, colleges, universities; private-public; undergraduate, graduate, professional.
   4. The mobility of students--resident and nonresident problems.

B. The Nature of the Educational Demand
   1. Motivation in college attendance--economic, cultural factors.
   2. Shifts in educational interests--sciences, arts, business, public services.
   3. Expansion and diversification in curricula--innovations in subject-matter.

C. Instructional Adjustments
   1. Some problems of "mass"--adjustments in class size; changing student-teacher relationships; impersonality as an educational factor.
   2. Changes in organization--class size as a problem; adjusted teaching loads.
   3. Means and methods of instruction--new techniques; television; lectures and examinations.
   4. Changing responsibilities of students and teachers.
   5. Growth of special services for students.

D. Institutional Provisions
   1. The establishment of new colleges and universities.
   2. The expansion of present institutions--problems of growth, staff and space; reassessment of enrollment limits; development of urban institutions.
   3. The community colleges--special role in higher education; the tendency toward local education.
   4. The expansion of financial support--increases in student fees, taxes; new sources of support.
   5. Development of branch institutions, extension and

part-time programs.

E. Federal Aid and Federal Intervention
   1. Federal aid for instructional improvement and expansion.
   2. Aid to students.
   3. Aid to institutions.
   4. The concept of education as a national interest--defense and welfare activities; impact on curriculum.

F. Public Interest and Support
   1. Organized public relations.
   2. The enlistment of private and business interests.
   3. The necessity for political support.
   4. The role of foundations.
   5. The development of educational planning.

G. Research as a Dimension of Higher Education
   1. The acceptance of organized research as an educational function.
   2. Research claims on staff, time and resources.
   3. The impact of research upon academic organization, teaching, graduate schools, finance.
   4. The influence of research upon concepts of higher education--specialization, the role of universities, the academic profession.

H. Higher Education as General Public Service
   1. Special services to agriculture and business.
   2. The growth of social services.
   3. Specialized organizations--centers--and specialized personnel.
   4. Special services to federal, state and local governments.
   5. The growth of bureaucracy in higher education.

Continuing Problems of Higher Education

A. The Problem of Quality in Higher Education
   1. The meaning and measurement of quality.
   2. Quality and faculty training, specialization, attitudes, interests and loyalties.
   3. Students as factors in the determination of quality.
   4. The effect of academic organization on quality--

courses, credits, degree requirements, examinations, etc.
5. The measure of a "successful" college or university.

B. The Academic Profession
1. The changing patterns of professional success.
2. The professor--an interchangeable manpower resource.
3. Colleges and universities as employers.
4. The continuing problem of the education, recruitment and retention of faculty.

C. Administrative Organization and Procedures
1. Faculties in policy-making and administration.
2. Organization of new activities--research and public service.
3. Organization for educational improvement and innovation.
4. Problems of internal efficiency in higher education.
5. The management of educational bureaucracy.
6. Conflict on the campus--causes and resolution.

D. Direct and Indirect Controls in Higher Education
1. The "cultural climate" as educational control--effect on admission policies, levels of financial support, intellectual interests and effort, institutional self-direction.
2. Faculty autonomy--myth or reality? Problems of unity and separation, internal rivalries, etc.
3. The influence of extramural organizations upon administration--learned and professional societies; AAUP; alumni association.
4. The pervasive influence of "public relations" upon operations.
5. National interest and higher education--implications for administration and control.
6. Private influences--foundations, corporations, labor and professional groups.
7. Academic freedom under new conditions.

E. Educational Planning and Administrative Implications
1. The establishment of "systems" in higher education--New York, California, Ohio, Oregon, etc.
2. Decision-making in coordinated systems.
3. Financial planning, operations and control.
4. Self-direction and autonomy under coordinated systems.

Bibliographical Note

Most students of higher education have some knowledge of the general field of education. The literature of educational administration has been preoccupied, as it should have been, with elementary and secondary schools which, until now, have been the major concerns of American education. Recently, the upsurge of interest and the growth in magnitude of higher education has extended to colleges and universities the educator's passion for self-examination.

The range of reading pertinent to the study of the administration of higher education is wide and varied. The study is a synthetic one, the product of many fields of knowledge. It must include educational history and philosophy, psychology, sociology, and economics, theories of organization and management, as well as practical aspects of finance and property management.

To achieve perspective, several books on the history of higher education and on the nature of American universities are suggested. Among these are: Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University: A History (New York: Knopf, 1962); R. Freeman Butts, The College Charts its Course: Historical Conceptions and Current Proposals, 3rd Edition, (New York and London: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1955); Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger, The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955). A scholarly and thoughtful discussion will be found in L. R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965).

In addition to these more purely historical accounts, three other books may be mentioned which relate to basic conceptions of higher education: in the works of Cardinal John Henry Newman, The Idea of a University (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1914-1924), chapter 16; Abraham Flexner, Universities, American, English, and German (New York: Oxford University Press, 1930); Thorstein Veblen, The Higher Learning in America (New York: Sagamore Press, 1957). The first book has been inspirational in shaping a moral and intellectual conception of higher education. The latter two are based upon essentially European concepts of universities and are highly critical of American institutions. They have affected both European and American opinion.

For insights into more current conceptions of higher education an interesting philosophical treatment is: Karl Jaspers, The Idea of the University (Boston: Beacon Press, 1959). A general and voluminous treatment is Nevitt Sanford (ed.), The American College (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1962).

Other useful books along the same line are: Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963); John D. Millett, The Academic Community (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962); Logan Wilson (ed.), Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education (Washington: American Council on Education, 1965); Samuel Baskin (ed.), Higher Education: Some Newer Developments (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965); T. R. McConnell, A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962).

As developments create new and reciprocal relationships between society in general and institutions of higher learning, social scientists have given the study of higher education more and more attention. The result is an increasing number of monographs dealing with subjects which range over such fields as the economic value of a college education, the academic profession, the financing of higher education, and education and politics. To indicate the scope and character of such discussions two recent symposia may be mentioned: Seymour Harris (ed.) Challenge and Change in American Education (Berkeley, Calif: McCutchan Pub., 1965), and Education and Public Policy (Berkeley, Calif: McCutchan Pub., 1965).

On more purely administrative aspects of higher education the student will find much (especially if he is good at reading between the lines) in the biographies and autobiographies of distinguished American educators: Eliot, Gilman, Butler, Wilson, Harper, Jordan. Excerpts from these and other sources will be found conveniently in Richard Hofstadter and Wilson Smith (eds.), American Higher Education --A Documentary History (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961). Much is also to be found in the speeches, annual reports and occasional papers of prominent contemporary educators such as Conant, Hutchins, Sproul, Dodds, Wriston and others. More recently a number of more systematic treatises on college and university presidencies and on the administration of higher education have appeared: Harold W. Dodds, The Academic President--Educator or Caretaker? (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962); Henry M. Wriston, Academic Procession (New York: Columbia Press, 1959); Harold W. Stoke, The American College President (New York: Harper, 1959); John J. Corson, The Governance of Colleges and Universities (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960).

With the expansion of higher education has come an increasing recognition that many of its administrative problems are like those of other large scale enterprises. This means that much of the literature applicable to the administration and management of business and government may be read with

profit by administrators of colleges and universities. To be reminded, however, that there are some differences, the student should read, Robert M. Hutchins, "The Administrator," Journal of Higher Education, 17, November, 1946, pp. 395-407. The current literature to be found in certain professional and learned journals is a rich source of understanding--usually articles by people who have pondered long on some aspect of higher education and feel strongly about it. Among such sources are: The Journal of Higher Education; AAUP Bulletin; The Educational Record of the American Council on Education; the publications of the Association of Higher Education, NEA; College and University Business Management.

Federal intervention in higher education has created completely new facets to the study of educational administration. The scope and rapidity of these developments make it impossible to comprehend them in any single source. Perhaps the best summary account, although now outdated, is still to be found in the Report of the House Committee on Education and Labor, "The Federal Government and Education," (Washington: 1963). While this does not include the transformation brought about by federal legislation in 1964 and 1965, it provides an informal background for these developments. A good discussion of the relation of the federal government to higher education is: Harold Orlans, The Effects of Federal Programs on Higher Education: A Study of 36 Universities and Colleges (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1962).

Particular attention should be called to a position paper by Keith Goldhammer entitled, The Social Sciences and the Preparation of Educational Administrators, a work which grew out of an Administration Task Force meeting co-sponsored by UCEA and the University of Alberta. This publication is one of the earlier (1963) expositions of the relations of the social sciences to the study of administration.

The citation of particular books and sources is intended only to help the reader find his way to wider sources.